

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 3 June 2005. Responsive to that Office Action, Claims 1, 11, and 16 are now amended, and Claims 17-18 are inserted for further prosecution with the other pending Claims. It is believed that with such amendment of Claims, there is a further clarification of their recitations.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that the Claim's scope is uncertain given the use of a Trademark or trade name therein. It is believed that the amendment of Claim 16 incorporated hereby now obviates the Examiner's formal concerns under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-13 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Oldendorf, et al. reference in view of the Bianca, et al. reference. In setting forth this rejection, the Examiner acknowledged that Oldendorf, et al. fails to disclose transferring of a metal belt or not releasing the covers after a stamping process. The Examiner, however, cited Bianca, et al. for disclosing the creation of frames using a sheet of metal conveyed through a series of stamping machines. The Examiner then concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Oldendorf, et al.'s

teachings accordingly. The Examiner further acknowledged that Oldendorf, et al., even as modified by Bianca, et al., fails to disclose a number of other claimed features, but concluded such features to have nonetheless been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oldendorf, et al. and Bianca, et al., further in view of the Farquhar, et al. reference. The Examiner cited Farquhar, et al. for disclosing the use of adhesives for bonding plastic frames to form a card package. Again, the Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated such feature into the teachings of Oldendorf, et al. and Bianca, et al.

As each of the newly-amended independent Claims 1 and 11 now more clearly recites, Applicant's process/package includes among its combination of features the formation of first and second metal shelves having "a plurality of stakes" extending therefrom. First and second plastic frames are respectively securely coupled to the first and second metal shelves, with the "first and second plastic frames having said stakes embedded therein," as Claims 1 and 11 also now more clearly recite.

The full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by Applicant's pending Claims is nowhere disclosed by the cited references. Note in this regard that while the primarily-cited Oldendorf, et al. reference does

disclose protrusions 55 on its covers 30, 40, these protrusions 55 serve merely a lateral stopping function for the surrounding insulative frames 52, 62. That is, these “lateral protrusions 55 ... serve to retain the top and bottom insulative frames 52 and 62 along the lateral sides 16 and 17” of the covers 30, 40, as the reference itself explains (column 5; lines 2-6). The reference prescribes the insulative frames 52, 62 to be captively received within the U-shaped channel formed by respective grounding members 35 and 45, such that they necessarily wrap around the outer lateral periphery of the covers’ sides. As Oldendorf, et al. further explicates, then, the lateral “protrusions 55 of the covers serve to support the insulative frames 52 and 62” in this manner (column 6; lines 41-42), bearing against the frames’ inner lateral walls.

Nowhere does Oldendorf, et al. disclose or even suggest that such lateral protrusions 55 are in any way actually “embedded” in any first or second plastic frame, as Claim 1 now more clearly recites for “stakes” formed to extend from “first and second metal shelves.” Indeed, Oldendorf, et al. largely obviates even the need for such embedding, as it provides for captive engagement of the insulative frames – within the receiving U-channels of the grounding members 35, 45.

Given such contrary teachings of the primarily-cited Oldendorf, et al. reference, the disclosures of the secondarily-cited Bianca, et al. and Farquhar, et al. references are found to be quite ineffectual to the present patentability analysis.

These references were cited for teaching other incidental features. They fail to remedy the deficiencies of Oldendorf, et al.'s teachings.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the cited Oldendorf, et al., Bianca, et al., and Farquhar, et al. references, even when considered together, fail to disclose the unique combination of elements now more clearly recited by Applicant's pending Claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application. The other reference cited by the Examiner is found to be further remote from Applicant's claimed process/package when patentability considerations are taken properly into account.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262

Dated: 9/2/2005

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586